

### REMARKS

Claims 1-39 are pending in this application, of which Claims 1, 4, 12, 13, 17, 18 and 28 are in independent form. Claims 10, 11, 14-16 and 32 have been canceled, a recitation of canceled Claim 32 being incorporated into Claim 28; these actions are taken without prejudice or disclaimer of subject matter. Claims 1-9, 12, 13 and 17-28 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicant regards as his invention.

Applicant notes with appreciation the allowance of Claims 1-9.

Claims 10-39 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,990,968 (Naka et al.) in view of U.S. Patents 5,389,975 (Maeshima et al.) and 6,430,363 (Sasaki et al.).

First, the cancellation of Claims 10, 11, 14-16 and 32 renders the rejection of those claims moot.

Independent Claim 12 is directed to an image processing device that comprises at least one signal input unit to which video signals of a plurality of systems are inputted, a memory unit having a memory region for storing images of at least one screen, at least one image display signal output unit, and image processing means for synthesizing the video signals of the systems on the memory unit to output it to the signal output units, and control means for controlling the image processing means. The control means, having communication means for outputting a request of changing image characteristics to at least one input video signal of the plural systems, select a preferential video signal according to image characteristic information of the video signals of the systems, change the operation of the image processing means to one appropriate for the video signal of the preferential

system, and output a request of changing image characteristics to those appropriate for the operation of that image processing means to video signals of at least one system other than the video signal of the preferential system.

Among other important features of Claim 12 (found in independent Claims 13, 17, 18 and Claim 28 also), are the means for request to a signal source. By virtue of this feature, the request to the signal source is not only to select a preferential signal but also to change an image characteristics of the other signal source. At the least, this feature is not believed to be taught or suggested by any of the cited references.

The Official Action states, in relation to Claims 12 and 17, that in *Naka*, a control line is connected to an external controller 21. However, the control line is not connected to a signal line 19. Accordingly, the signal line is apparently not controlled thereby. Fundamentally, according to the aspects of the present invention set forth in the independent claims in question (12, 13, 17, 18 and 28), in multi-image displaying on a display device based on different categories of image signals from a plurality of signal sources, the most suitable image displaying is set according to a displayed contents and use. In that respect, the structures recited in these claims are not suggested by *Naka* and *Maeshima* premised on displaying based on only one signal.

*Sasaki* relates to display of a recording simultaneously based on a plurality of signals, but is not believed to teach or suggest simultaneous display based on plural signals, and is silent as to a problem in the image quality in such displaying. Thus, in technical intention and purpose, *Sasaki* is different from the subject matter of these independent claims.

*Naka* detects the most suitable position of sampling. *Maeshima* discloses making most suitable the signal processing according to a video mode. However, none of the cited references discloses selecting most suitable characteristics of the signal from the plurality of image signals like the present invention. Thus, according to the present invention, the most preferential input signal is selected based on the signal characteristics of the respective signals. Accordingly to the present invention, based on the image characteristics information of the plural image signals, the preferential input signal is selected and is subjected to the signal processing by the selecting means to maximize image quality displayed in a multi-images simultaneously, which is not disclosed in the cited references and can not be readily deduced therefrom even if they are combined. Accordingly, Applicant believes that Claims 12, 13, 17, 18 and 28 are allowable over these three patents, taken separately or in any permissible combination (if any).


A review of the other art of record has failed to reveal anything which, in Applicant's opinion, would remedy the deficiencies of the art discussed above, as references against the independent claims in question, and those claims are therefore believed patentable over the art of record.

The other rejected claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual reconsideration of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully requests favorable reconsideration and passage to issue of the present application.

Applicant's undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicant

Registration No. 29,286

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-3801  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

NY\_MAIN 387584 v1